



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/653,666	09/02/2003	Koichi Takahashi	JP920020097US1	4625
36736	7590	10/12/2007	EXAMINER	
DUKE W. YEE YEE & ASSOCIATES, P.C. P.O. BOX 802333 DALLAS, TX 75380			SMARTH, GERALD A	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2146	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/12/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/653,666	TAKAHASHI, KOICHI	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Gerald Smarth	2146	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 July 2007.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 9-17, 19 and 20 is/are pending in the application.
  - 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 9-17, 19 and 20 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
  - a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
    1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
    2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
    3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>7/13/2007</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## DETAILED ACTION

1. It is hereby acknowledged that the following papers have been received and placed of record in the file: Remark date 7/11/07
2. Claims 9-17, & 19-20 are presented for examination. Claim 1-8, & 18 is currently being cancelled. Claims 9-17 are currently being amended. Claims 19 and 20 are currently being added.
3. The Rejections are respectfully maintained and reproduced infra for application's convenience.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

4. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.
5. Claim 19 & 20 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject

matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

These two claims are not explained in the specification and can be considered to convey multiple subject matter. It is not described what the last two components which makes up the last components are. It further does not explain how the last two components are being used when combined compared to strictly the last component.

6. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

7. Claim 19 & 20 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding claim 19, the computer equipment according to claim 9, wherein the last component in the plurality of components comprises a last two components. This claim is not specifying what the last two components consist of to make up the last component. This is considered vague and not specific to the examiner.

Regarding claim 20, the program product according to claim 15, wherein the last components comprises a last two components in the plurality of components.

This claim is not specifying what the last two components consist of to make up the last component. This is considered vague and not specific to the examiner.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claim 9-20 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Isomichi(6938171) as applied to claim above, and further in view of Vogut (US2001/0037292).

Regarding Claim 9, Isomichi teaches is drawn to computer equipment relaying transmission of an HTTP request and return of an HTTP response between a terminal and a server; comprising: HTTP request transfer means for relaying the HTTP response with a cookie sent from a browser of the terminal to transfer the HTTP request with said cookie to the server as a destination of the HTTP request (***(Isomichi's system relays requests and responses between a terminal and a server, including set-cookie information)***); and HTTP response transfer means for receiving the HTTP response returned from the server in response to

the HTTP request, deleting a domain described in a Set-Cookie header, rearranging components of said domain into an inverse order, embedding said rearranged components into a path described in said Set-Cookie header, and transferring the HTTP response with said Set-Cookie header to the terminal (*Isomichi's system removes the domain field, rearranges it, and places it in the path field of the set-cookie header before sending the response back to the terminal, as can be seen in Figure 10*). Isomichi does not teach wherein by a punctuation character, and wherein rearranging the plurality of components of said domain in the inverse order includes exchanging positions of a first and last component of the plurality of components of said domain.

Isomichi and Vogut are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor network security.

Vogut teaches teach wherein by a punctuation character, and wherein rearranging the plurality of components of said domain in the inverse order includes exchanging positions of a first and last component of the plurality of components of said domain. (Vogut discloses for example, if the domain specifier for a cookie is ".netzero.net", the equivalent path specifier would be the reversed version (again, replacing periods with slashes) which would be "/ten/orezten/". The domain specifier for the cookie can then be removed. Since the path specifier for the cookie now contains the original domain information, the original path information is prepended to the cookie value and terminated with a " " separator. For example, if the cookie value is "data" and the path is "/images", the new cookie value would be "/images data". ; Page 4 Paragraph 48))

It would be obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify a HTTP request and return of an HTTP response between a terminal and a server to include a cookie with a path specifier which is a domain specifier reversed. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make this modification in order to have a domain specifier reversed and replaced in the cookie because it allows for cookies to be returned to and accepted by the

Art Unit: 2146

client's browser. This allows for different components of the proxy server to be located at different physical locations. The advantage is that special software is not required to be installed on either the client (user) or merchant end of a transaction. As such, spenders and funders are not required to install any software on their personal computers in addition to a typical browser,. Also, the online merchants are not required to install any special server software or modify their web pages in order to accommodate the surrogate transactions; page 2 paragraph 21.

Therefore, it would be obvious to combine Vogut and Isomichi for HTTP response and reverse domain specifier as taught in claim 9.

Regarding claim 10, Isomichi taught the computer according to claim 9, as was taught above. Isomichi further teaches, "wherein said HTTP request transfer means specifies a port number of a communication port on the server together with said domain of the server, and transfers the HTTP request to the server." **(Isomichi discloses the specification of a port on a server is inherent in TCP/IP communications when transferring data to or from a server.)**

Regarding claim 11, Isomichi taught the computer equipment according to claim 9, as described above. Isomichi further teaches adds, "wherein said HTTP response transfer means adds a predetermined fixed-character string to said Set-Cookie header according to the HTTP response, and transfers the HTTP response with said Set-Cookie header to the terminal." **(In Isomichi's system, the gateway adds the Designation ID to the set-cookie header and transfers the response to the terminal, as seen in Figure 10.)**

Regarding claim 12, the computer equipment according to Claim 9, wherein said HTTP response transfer means compiles the plurality of components necessary for identifying said domain when rearranging [[them]] the plurality of components in inverse order, and transfers the HTTP response to the terminal. **(Isomichi's**

**(system compiles different data when reconstructing the set-cookie header, including a Designation ID and the Gateway Server Name, arranges said data in an order that will be understood by the terminal, and send the response to the terminal, as in Figure 10.)**

Regarding claim 13, the computer equipment according to Claim 9, wherein said HTTP response transfer means replaces a domain parameter of the server in said Set-Cookie header by its-own another server name, and transfers the HTTP response to the terminal. **(Isomichi's discloses system replaces the domain with a Designation ID, which is used by the Gateway Server to refer to a position in a lookup table that is stored on said server (as seen in figures 4 and 10) before sending the response to the terminal. There are multiple URLs domain names from figure 4.)**

Regarding claim 14, Isomichi teaches a data processing method for relaying data exchanged between first computer equipment and second computer equipment, comprising ~: receiving a response sent from the first computer equipment to the second computer equipment(**Figure 9, S61**); determining whether said response includes a Set-Cookie header(**Figure 9, \$62**);, wherein said Set-Cookie header includes a domain having a plurality of components, and wherein the plurality of components are separated by a punctuation character; rewriting said Set-Cookie header when said response includes said Set-Cookie header so that a cookie set on the second computer equipment based on said Set-Cookie header will have a format recognizable by the second computer equipment(**Figure 9, S65**); wherein rewriting said Set-Cookie header includes exchanging positions of a first and last component of the plurality of components of said domain; and sending the second computer equipment said response with said rewritten-Set-Cookie header. **(Isomichi's system sends the response on to the user after the reverse conversion process [column 10, lines 42-46]).**

(Vogut discloses further added limitations by disclosing for example, if the domain specifier for a cookie is ".netzero.net", the equivalent path specifier would be the reversed version (again, replacing periods with slashes) which would be "/ten/orezten/". The domain specifier for the cookie can then be removed. Since the path specifier for the cookie now contains the original domain information, the original path information is prepended to the cookie value and terminated with a " " separator. For example, if the cookie value is "data" and the path is "/images", the new cookie value would be "/images data". ; Page 4 Paragraph 48)

Regarding claim 15, Isomichi teaches a program product in a recordable type medium (Isomichichi claim 9 line 1)for controlling computer equipment relaying data exchanged between first computer equipment and second computer equipment to perform predetermined data processing, comprising: first processing means for receiving a response sent from the first computer equipment to the second computer equipment(**Figure 9, S61** ); second processing means for rewriting a Set-Cookie header when said response includes said Set-Cookie header so that a cookie set on the second computer equipment (**Figure 9, S65**); based on said Set-Cookie header will have a format recognizable by the second computer equipment, wherein said Set-Cookie header includes a domain having a plurality of components, wherein the plurality of components are separated by a punctuation character, and wherein rewriting said Set-Cookie header includes exchanging positions of a first and last component of the plurality of components of said domain; and third processing means for sending the second computer equipment said response with said rewritten Set-Cookie header. (**Isomichi's system sends the response on to the user after the reverse conversion process [column 10, lines 42-46].**)

Isomichi does not specifically teach the added limitations.

Vogut teaches wherein said Set-Cookie header includes a domain having a plurality of components, wherein the plurality of components are separated by

a punctuation character, and wherein rewriting said Set-Cookie header includes exchanging positions of a first and last component of the plurality of components of said domain; (Vogut discloses further added limitations by disclosing for example, if the domain specifier for a cookie is ".netzero.net", the equivalent path specifier would be the reversed version (again, replacing periods with slashes) which would be "/ten/orezten/". The domain specifier for the cookie can then be removed. Since the path specifier for the cookie now contains the original domain information, the original path information is prepended to the cookie value and terminated with a " " separator. For example, if the cookie value is "data" and the path is "/images", the new cookie value would be "/images data". ; Page 4 Paragraph 48)

It would be obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify a HTTP request and return of an HTTP response between a terminal and a server to include a cookie with a path specifier which is a domain specifier reversed. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make this modification in order to have a domain specifier reversed and replaced in the cookie because it allows for cookies to be returned to and accepted by the client's browser. This allows for different components of the proxy server to be located at different physical locations. The advantage is that special software is not required to be installed on either the client (user) or merchant end of a transaction. As such, spenders and funders are not required to install any software on their personal computers in addition to a typical browser,. Also, the online merchants are not required to install any special server software or modify their web pages in order to accommodate the surrogate transactions; page 2 paragraph 21.

Therefore, it would be obvious to combine Vogut and Isomichi for HTTP response and reverse domain specifier to be combined to obtain claim 15.

Regarding 16,Isomichi and Vogt taught the program product according to Claim 15, as described above. Vogt further teaches wherein during processing in said

second processing means for rewriting said Set-Cookie header, a sequence of [[a]] said domain included in said Set-Cookie header of said response is altered into an inverse order, and a delimiter of said domain is replaced by a predetermined character to generate a path including said domain rearranged into said inverse order. (***(Figure 10 of Isomichi's disclosure, which describes the reverse conversion process, the domain field in the set-cookie header is changed, placed into the path field, and then removed completely. The delimiter". is also replaced by "/".)***)

Regarding claim 17, Isomichi teaches the program product according to Claim 15, as described above. Isomichi teaches further comprising means for controlling the first and second computer equipment to rewrite said domain and [[said]] a first path of a link and location included in said response in conformity with [[said]] a second path (Fig 4) included in said Set-Cookie header. (***(Isomichi teaches as can be seen in Figure 10 of Isomichi's disclosure, as part of the reverse conversion process, the domain and path of the link in the body of the HTML document are changed in accordance with the change to the domain and path in the set-cookie header. Fig 4 shows multiple paths/destinations.)***)

Regarding claim 19, Isomichi and Vogut taught the computer equipment according to claim 9, as described above. Vogut further teaches wherein the last component in the plurality of components comprises a last two components.

**(Isomichi discloses domain=zzzzzz.co.jp;path=/; as shown in (a) noted on the right of the flowchart in FIG. 9, is written.; Column 9 line 6-7)**

Regarding claim 20, Isomichi and Vogut taught the program product according to claim 15, as described above. Isomichi further teaches wherein the last components comprises a last two components in the plurality of components.

**(Isomichi discloses domain=.zzzzzz.co.jp;path=/; as shown in (a) noted on the right of the flowchart in FIG. 9, is written.; Column 9 line 6-7)**

### **Response to Argument**

Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 9-17, 19 and 20 have been considered but are moot in view of new ground(s) or rejection.

Applicant added limitation for claim 9, 14, and 15 are being anticipated by Vogt. Vogt shows the feature wherein rearranging the plurality of components of said domain in the inverse order includes exchanging positions of a first and last component of the plurality of components of said domain and the feature wherein the plurality of components of said domain are separated by a punctuation character. Claims 10-13, 16-20 are being anticipate by Isomichi. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action.

### **Conclusion**

10. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.**  
See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gerald Smarth whose telephone number is (571)270-1923. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday(7:30am-5:00pm)est.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jeff Pwu can be reached on (571)272-6798. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2146

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



Gerald Smarth

10/03/07

JEFFREY PWU  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER